

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner:

- a) rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; and
- b) rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanazawa et al. (Japan Application Publication No. 2001 -054147, hereinafter "*Kanazawa*").

Status of the Claims

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 1-15, amended claim 16 and added new claims 17-35. Support for the amendments can be found throughout Applicant's specification and in the drawings as originally filed.

Response to Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicant has amended claim 16 to address the Examiner's concern and thus respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Response to Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kanazawa*, as set forth in the Office Action.

In order to properly establish that *Kanazawa* anticipates claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is

contained in the ... claim.” See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 16 now recites a combination including, for example, “determining [a] pattern velocity based on [] first images [of a test pattern captured while the test pattern is moved on the screen at a pattern velocity].” Applicant respectfully submits that *Kanazawa* fails to teach or suggest at least the above-recited element of claim 1 and thus does not anticipate the claim.

Kanazawa describes a data acquisition and measurement device for collecting data from a display device and measuring a dynamic characteristic of the display device. See *Kanazawa*, Abstract. *Kanazawa* states that “[a] rotation control signal (c) to rotate a rotary mirror 3 synchronously with the image signal (a) is given to a driver 4.” See *Kanazawa*, Abstract and paragraph 0026. Accordingly, *Kanazawa* requires the rotation control signal be synchronized with the image signal. However, *Kanazawa* makes absolute no mention of a method comprising “determining [a] pattern velocity based on [] first images [of a test pattern captured while the test pattern is moved on the screen at a pattern velocity]” (emphasis added), as now recited in claim 16.

For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that *Kanazawa* fails to teach or suggest every element of claim 16 and therefore claim 16 should be allowable.

New Claims

New independent claims 20 and 30 incorporate all of the elements of amended claim 16. For at least the reason discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 20 and 30 is also allowable over the *Kanazawa* reference.

New claims 17-19, 21-29, and 31-35 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 16, 20, or 30. For at least the same reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims are also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 17, 2010

By: 

Robert E. Converse, Jr.
Reg. No. 27,432